

REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 9, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-19 are pending, the independent claims being 1, 2, 5, 8, 10, 11, 14 and 17. Since the claims are already in proper form, no amendment is made of them. Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 11, 14 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,911,982 to Signes.

Claim 1 recites, ". . . wherein said transmitter terminal includes a storage memory for storing the coded data for use at a plurality of instants later than said given instant in respectively forming the plural access points."

Signes fails to disclose or suggest this aspect of the present claim 1.

Signes relates to creating access points (col. 8, line 53: "access points"), each of which corresponds to "another" scene (col. 8, line 44: "another"), i.e., a "new scene" (abstract: "new scene") (see also, col. 8, line 66 - col. 9, line 2). Signes creates the access points using a frame 13 with specific code 3 (col. 6, line 45). Some frames 13 merely make modifications to an existing scene (col. 5, line 26). Signes is silent on the coding of the frames 13. However, a new scene presumably is "formed by" new data. Re-using the same data would not afford a "new" scene. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Signes fails to disclose the above-quoted aspect of the present claim 1.

The Office Action cites to lines 40-55 of column 8 in Signes in reference to the above-quoted aspect of the present claim 1.

This passage states that the subsequent access point corresponds to "another" scene (col. 8, line 44), which is an essential point in the discussion herein above.

The passage also discusses prior art use of a "single" scene (col. 8, line 46: "single scene"), but for a single access point rather than "in respectively forming the plural access points," which language explicitly appears in the present claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Signes fails to anticipate the present invention as recited in claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, it would not have been obvious to modify Signes to resemble the present claim 1.

Claim 2 uses language similar to that of claim 1, and is likewise patentable over Signes.

Claim 5 recites, "A method of forming, in a data stream, access points by data coded at a given instant, said access points providing a description of a particular complete scene, comprising: storing said coded data; and using the stored data at several later instants to form respective ones of said access points."

Claim 5 distinguishes patentably over Signes for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Claim 10 recites, "... transmitter terminal is configured . . . for using the stored data, at multiple instants later than said instant of the given instants, to form multiple respective ones of said plural access points. . ."

For at least the same reasons cited above with regard to claim 1, claim 10 likewise distinguishes patentably over Signes.

Claim 11 recites, "... storing. . . said data coded at an instant of the given instants and for using the stored data, at multiple instants later than said instant of the given instants, to form multiple respective ones of said plural access points. . ."

For at least the same reasons cited above with regard to claim 1, claim 11 likewise distinguishes patentably over Signes.

Claim 14 recites, "... storing data coded at a given instant . . . using, at multiple later instants, the stored data to form multiple respective access points. . ."

Claim 14 distinguishes patentably over the cited reference for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to the present claim 1.

As to all of the above-mentioned independent claims, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 12, 13 and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Signes in view of "ISO/IEC MPEG-4 Standards Document," ("MPEG-4 Standards").

Claim 8 recites, "... access points formed by data coded at a given instant and providing a description of a particular complete scene, wherein at least various successive access points are formed using the same description of the particular complete scene. . ."

Claim 8 distinguishes patentably over Signes for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1. MPEG-4 Standards cannot make up for the deficiencies in Signes.

Claim 17 recites, ". . . multiple successive ones of said access points are formed by the same description of said scene. . ."

Claim 17 distinguishes patentably over Signes for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1. MPEG-4 Standards cannot make up for the shortcomings of Signes.

Each of the other rejected claims depends from a respective base claim and is deemed to be patentable over the cited references at least due to its dependency.

Moreover, each warrants further consideration based on its individual, additional merits.

For example, the "non-zero phase shift" in claim 3 is among the aspects in the above 17 claims not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record.


Reconsideration and withdrawal of each claim rejection in the Office Action is respectfully requested.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski
Registration No. 42,079

Date: May 9, 2006


By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Mail all correspondence to:
Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313 on May 9, 2006.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069
(Name of Registered Rep.)


(Signature and Date)